

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ARTHUR MULLINS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-cv-10372

v.

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

FORD MOTOR COMPANY;  
and BRIAN BUTCHER, an individual,

Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

Defendants.

---

James B. Rasor (P43476)  
Andrew J. Laurila (P78880)  
RASOR LAW FIRM, PLLC  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
201 E. Fourth St.  
Royal Oak, MI 48067  
(248) 543-9000  
jbr@rasorlawfirm.com  
ajl@rasorlawfirm.com

Elizabeth Hardy (P37426)  
Thomas J. Davis (P78626)  
KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO  
PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.  
Attorneys for Defendants  
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Ste. 400  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 645-0000  
ehardy@khvpf.com  
tdavis@khvpf.com

---

**Defendants' Motion to Amend Judgment to Reflect Costs  
Under 28 U.S.C. § 1920**



Defendants Ford Motor Company (“Ford”) and Bryan Butcher (“Butcher”), by their undersigned counsel, hereby move this Court pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d) and 28 U.S.C. § 1920 to amend the Judgment entered in this matter on July 7, 2021 to include the \$2,691.35 awarded to Defendants in the Clerk’s July 15, 2021 Taxed Bill of Costs. Plaintiff did not file a motion to review the taxed bill and the time to do so has now elapsed. Thus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920, the allowed costs should be “included in the judgment or decree.” On July 30, 2021, undersigned counsel requested concurrence in the relief requested, and concurrence was not obtained.

WHEREFORE, Defendants request that the Court amend the Judgment to reflect the \$2,691.35 award of costs in favor of Defendants.

Respectfully submitted,

KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO  
PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.

By: /s/Thomas J. Davis

Elizabeth P. Hardy (P37426)

Thomas J. Davis (P78626)

Attorneys for Defendants

280 N. Old Woodward Avenue, Suite 400

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 645-0000

ehardy@khvpf.com

tdavis@khvpf.com

Date: July 30, 2021



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ARTHUR MULLINS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-cv-10372

v.

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

FORD MOTOR COMPANY;  
and BRIAN BUTCHER, an individual,

Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

Defendants.

---

James B. Rasor (P43476)  
Andrew J. Laurila (P78880)  
RASOR LAW FIRM, PLLC  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
201 E. Fourth St.  
Royal Oak, MI 48067  
(248) 543-9000  
jbr@rasorlawfirm.com  
ajl@rasorlawfirm.com

Elizabeth Hardy (P37426)  
Thomas J. Davis (P78626)  
KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO  
PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.  
Attorneys for Defendants  
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Ste. 400  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 645-0000  
ehardy@khvpf.com  
tdavis@khvpf.com

---

**Defendants' Brief in Support of Motion to Amend Judgment to Reflect Costs  
Under 28 U.S.C. § 1920**



### **Issue Presented**

The statute governing taxation of costs, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, states that “[a] bill of costs shall be filed in the case and, upon allowance, included in the judgment or decree.” Here, the Clerk allowed costs of \$2,691.35 in favor of Defendants. Plaintiff did not file a motion to review that award within the time permitted. Should the Court amend the judgment to include the awarded costs?



**Controlling or Most Appropriate Authorities**

*Menovcik v. BASF Corp.*, 2012 WL 3853011 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 5, 2012)

28 U.S.C. § 1920

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1)



## **Background**

On July 7, 2021, the Court entered Judgment in favor of Defendants. ECF No. 43. On July 15, 2021, Defendants filed a bill of costs. ECF No. 44. Later that day, the Clerk taxed costs in Defendants' favor in the amount of \$2,691.35. ECF No. 45. Plaintiff did not file a motion to review the clerk's taxation of costs within the seven days permitted by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).

## **Argument**

Rule 54(d)(1) provides that “[u]nless a federal statute, these rules, or a court order provides otherwise, costs—other than attorney’s fees—should be allowed to the prevailing party.” Allowable costs are set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1920, which specifically provides that a “bill of costs shall be filed in the case and, upon allowance, included in the judgment or decree.”

Here, Defendants have filed a bill of costs; the Clerk taxed \$2,691.35 of the requested costs, and no timely challenge to the Clerk’s action has been filed. That award has thus been allowed, and the Court should amend the judgment to include the \$2,691.35 of costs awarded to Defendants, as called for in § 1920. The case of *Menovcik v. BASF Corp.*, No. 09-12096, 2012 WL 3853011 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 5, 2012) is directly on point in support of this request. There, the court held that the “right to a judgment that reflects costs is clearly established by 28 U.S.C. § 1920, which provides that an allowed bill of costs should be ‘included in the judgment or



decree.” *Id.* at \*2 (quoting *Whitesell Corp. v. Whirlpool Corp.*, No. 1:05-CV-679, 2010 WL 11537526, at \*2 (W.D. Mich. June 11, 2010)). Because Defendants have received an award of costs, “an amended judgment reflecting the costs specifically allowed by the Court should be entered.” *Menovcik*, 2012 WL 3853011 at \*2.

### **Conclusion**

The Court should amend the judgment to include the costs award of \$2,691.35 in favor of Defendants.

Respectfully submitted,

KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO  
PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.

By: /s/Thomas J. Davis  
Elizabeth P. Hardy (P37426)  
Thomas J. Davis (P78626)

Attorneys for Defendants  
280 N. Old Woodward Avenue, Suite 400  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 645-0000  
ehardy@khvpf.com  
tdavis@khvpf.com

Date: July 30, 2021



### **Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that on July 30, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record.

/s/Thomas J. Davis

Thomas J. Davis (P78626)

Kienbaum Hardy Viviano

Pelton & Forrest, P.L.C.

280 N. Old Woodward Avenue, Suite 400

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 645-0000

tdavis@khvpf.com

421382